

# EXHIBIT NNN

## Re: talk with the UNT Ad Hoc Journal Review Panel

---

**From:** "Walls, Levi" <leviwalls@my.unt.edu>  
**To:** "Ishiyama, John" <john.ishiyama@unt.edu>  
**Date:** Wed, 30 Sep 2020 19:21:03 -0500

---

Dear Dr. Ishiyama,

Sorry, one more thing I forgot to talk about. In my public statement, I mention offering criticism of one of the authors (and subsequently being told not to "censor" people) then going to Dr. Brand as a whistleblower. I actually had the chronology of these two things accidentally switched around when I wrote the public statement. It was only a few weeks later that I realized I'd switched the order of those two events in the statement. But, as I said in our interview, I went to Dr. Brand after seeing some of the insensitive things being said in an email chain of people considering writing responses, then a little while later I tried offering a critique on one of the writer's responses and was told not to do so again (by Dr. Jackson in his car). Sorry for that confusion! Let me know if you need me to talk to the panel again about either of those two things I thought of after the meeting was over. But I wanted to make sure to email about them.

Regards,

Levi Walls

---

**From:** Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 30, 2020 1:47 PM  
**To:** Ishiyama, John <John.Ishiyama@unt.edu>  
**Subject:** Re: talk with the UNT Ad Hoc Journal Review Panel  
Dear Dr. Ishiyama,

That post was from July 27, by the way.

Also, I thought of something that I should have mentioned. Around the time of the public backlash, there was an email chain where Dr. Cubero asked Dr. Jackson what the review process was for those responses. In response, he said,

"The majority of the authors are well-known, highly seasoned scholars, ranging from the Chair of the Harvard Music Department to the authors of books on Schenker and Schenkerian analysis. If you want to use the word "vetting" in this context of allowing distinguished scholars to communicate their views, then you can say that the respondents were "vetted" on the basis of their academic qualifications. The distinguished pedigrees of the contributors is supported by their short biographies at the end of the issue."

So that's, I think, an illuminating view into the mindset of Jackson (and by extension, the journal) as far as the "review" process for those responses goes.

Let me know if you have any other questions.

Regards,

Levi Walls

---

**From:** Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 30, 2020 12:24 PM  
**To:** Ishiyama, John <John.Ishiyama@unt.edu>  
**Subject:** Re: talk with the UNT Ad Hoc Journal Review Panel

I have written the following statement in an attempt to share my experiences and shed light on the situation regarding the Journal of Schenkerian Studies. Furthermore, the purpose of this statement is to emphasize how deeply sorry I am for my involvement in the journal. Although I had no control over the content of the journal, or over the decisions regarding review processes, I am guilty of complicity because I remained in the position after I realized that my whistleblowing efforts were for naught. I hope the following account provides helpful context:

In summer 2019 (when I had just finished my first year as a PhD student in music theory at UNT) I was asked if I would like to take on a research assistantship, as assistant editor of the JSS. It would allow me to gain skills in typesetting,

**UNT\_002552**